

Appl. No. 10/606,136
Amdt. dated 05/11/2006
Reply to Office action of 03/13/2006

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 6, 12-16, 21 and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under US Patent No. 3,258,019 in view of US Patent No. 5,993,739 to Lyon. Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Bellas in view of Lyon and further in view of Ross (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0031507).

Applicant respectfully cancels claims 1- 30 and presents new claims 31-38 of which claims 31 and 35 are independent claims.

Before a claim may be rejected under section 103, the examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP, Section 2142. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation . . . to modify the reference or combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." MPEP, Section 2143. Applicant respectfully submits that the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of either independent claim 31 or 35. Independent claims 31 and 35 state the limitation "each of the sidewalls having a panel, each of the panels being hingedly connected to the roof and movable between a closed position and an open position wherein the panel extends outwardly from the roof to form a covering." None of the cited documents suggest or teach Applicant's limitation. The examiner asserts that Bellas teaches a "housing having expandable walls (Fig. 2, 3 and 6; col. 5, ll. 34-45.; col. 5-6), which are hinged to the roof and other walls."

The cited portions of Bellas provides at lines 34-35 of column 5, that "collapsible folding doors 62 are secured to the free vertical interior edge of the door sections 60." (emphasis added). Therefore, the doors of Bellas cannot be connected to the roof and cannot be moved to an open position extending outward from the roof to form a covering.

Appl. No. 10/606,136
Amdt. dated 05/11/2006
Reply to Office action of 03/13/2006

In independent claim 35, Applicant further claims the unit having a clothes washing machine and clothes dryer. (See Figure 3 and par. 26). The cited documents do not teach or suggest a mobile, washing vehicle system having a clothes washer or dryer.

Applicant respectfully submits that the new claims provided herein are novel and unobvious. Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner enter the amendment and issue a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

May 11, 2006
DATE

Correspondence Address:
Winstead Sechrest & Minick P.C.
P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, Texas 75201

Henry L Ehrlich
Henry L Ehrlich
Reg. No.: 39,663
Phone No.: 713-650-2778
Fax No.: 713-650-2400

Houston_1 852322v.1